





SPEECH

OF

MR. CLEMENT C. CLAY, JR.,

OF ALABAMA,

ON THE

CONTEST IN KANSAS

AND THE

PLAN AND PURPOSE OF BLACK REPUBLICANISM:

DELIVERED IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

ON MONDAY, 21ST APRIL, 1856.

WASHINGTON:
C. ALEXANDER, PRINTER,
F, near Seventeenth Street.
1856.



AFFAIRS OF KANSAS—SLAVERY QUESTION.

SPEECH

OF

MR. CLAY, OF ALABAMA,

IN THE SENATE, *April 21, 1856.*

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, having under consideration the bill to authorize the people of the Territory of Kansas to form a constitution and State government, preparatory to their admission into the Union when they have the required population,

MR. CLAY said :—MR. PRESIDENT : This debate, on the part of the advocates of insurrection in Kansas, has been worthy of their cause. From its inauguration by the Senator from New Hampshire, (Mr. HALE) in his furious onslaught upon the President's annual message, down to the attempt to foist upon the Senate the spurious memorial of the amateur legislature at Topeka, they have displayed more personal, partizan and sectional asperity than I have ever witnessed on this floor. They seem not to desire to restore peace, to preserve order, and sustain the laws, but to increase dissension, create disorder, and subvert the laws of that territory. They appear not as impartial arbiters of this great controversy, but as zealous advocates with contingent fees resting on its decision. Determined to know and to present but one side, they concede no violation of law, order, morality or propriety by their clients. Instead of exhibiting the impartiality, dignity and sobriety of an Areopagus, in whose justice and judgment contending states may confide, they have betrayed the rancorous prejudice of sectional bigotry and the blind passion of selfish partizanship. They have assailed the reputations not only of those who have appeared as prominent advocates of slavery in Kansas, but even of those who have espoused neither side, but have striven to stay the hand of violence and to do justice to both parties. The newspaper contributions of hireling and anonymous writers have been gravely paraded as testimony on which to decide this great issue, and with which to defame men whose integrity and patriotism have been, hitherto, without reproach and above suspicion. When challenged to give their author, they neither name him nor endorse his statement, but admit their high esteem for the man whom they aid in traducing. They seek to injure and to shirk responsibility—"willing to wound and yet afraid to strike."

The President has been assailed with a bitterness, characteristic rather of personal enmity than political antagonism.

The Missourians have been spoken of as foreign and barbarous enemies, rather than as fellow-citizens, descended from a common ancestry and devoted to the same civil and political destiny.

The South has been assailed as aggressive and overbearing; acquiring territory, or giving it away to aggrandize herself, and appropriating federal property and offices to her own use and to the exclusion of the North.

The North has not escaped detraction by her own sons: for they allege, that she has always had venal men in market, ready to sell themselves to serve the ambitious purposes of the South.—Those who proclaim the infamy of their own household, must share the shame and endure suspicion: and when they wantonly and maliciously charge members of their own family with selling themselves, people will suspect that they have escaped that debasement only for want of a purchaser.

Defence of the President.

The President needs not the shield of another to protect him against the missiles of their malice, and is more honored by their censure than their praise. Covered in the complete panoply of truth, he has no vulnerable point exposed—not even a tender heel—which the curs that bay at him can wound. If a love of country which embraces the whole Union, and knows no North, no South, no East, and no West, in the administration of the government; if a strict adherence to his professions of political faith and observance of all the pledges with which he came into office; if a vigilant guardianship of the Constitution, and unceasing vindication of its great principles; if these are marks of the true patriot, enlightened statesman and honest man, then has the President's official career illustrated that character. The people of his own section, deceived and misled by artifice, may unjustly condemn him in the present, but will in the future correct their error and unite with the South in awarding him the honor due to noble ends attained by noble means.

If the President's friends distrusted his fidelity to the Constitution and laws in discharging his official duty towards Kansas, the conflicting and contradictory charges of his enemies would furnish vindication.

The abolitionists charge that the President approved the Nebraska-Kansas bill to open new fields for slavery; the South Americans, that he

did so to enlarge the area of free soil.—The abolitionists say, his administration has been exerted to make Kansas a slave state; the South Americans, to make it a free state. The abolitionists abuse the President for removing Reeder; the South Americans for appointing him. The abolitionists say, he was removed too soon; the South Americans too late. The abolitionists say, he was removed for no official delinquency; the South Americans, that he was retained after repeated delinquencies. The abolitionists complain that squatters' sovereignty is frowned upon and threatened with suppression; the South Americans, that it is countenanced and encouraged. The abolitionists complain that the proclamation is levelled at free settlers; the South Americans, at pro-slavery men. Thus do the President's accusers contradict and refute each other, and prove that he has displeased extremists on both sides, by occupying that middle ground which is consistent with the rights of both North and South, and hostile to the interests of neither.

Nor, Sir, are the President's Northern accusers consistent with each other. The Senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. Wilson,) complains of the President for issuing his proclamation upon information communicated by Gov. Shannon; while the Senator from Illinois takes it to have been issued upon the information of Lane and Robbins. The advocates of the insurgents denounce him because of the proclamation, while some of their clients thank him for it. The Senator from New York, (Mr. Seward,) denounces the President as a tyrant, looks in history for his prototype, and finds it in the person of George III; the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Hale) seeks his similitude in a field more congenial to his taste, finds it in the vulgar arena, and denounces him as a demagogue.

Neither are the President's accusers consistent with themselves. The Senator from New York, after his formal arraignment and elaborate accusation of him as an accomplice of the Missouri invaders, virtually confessed the injustice of the charge, by failing to show the law the President had violated, or had not enforced, and by asking the question, "cannot Congress clothe him with power to act, and is it not his duty to ask power, to remove usurpation and subvert tyranny in a territory of the United States."

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Wilson) sat out with the bold assertion that the document sent us by the President would "carry a gigantic falsehood to the American people," made up of "rumors of the hour." Yet in his two days' speech of minute and elaborate details of Kansas affairs, he did not controvert or attempt to controvert a single material fact alleged by Gov. Shannon. That leading men had placed themselves in an attitude of rebellion towards the Government; that they were attempting to subvert existing authority and establish a Government of their own, and with that view had formed a secret military organization; that the execution of the laws had been openly resisted; that houses had been burned and

other property destroyed; that pro-slavery families had been driven from their homes and forced to seek shelter in Missouri; these portentous and startling facts were not disproven, or seriously questioned. Indeed, in his apocryphal history of Kansas he stated no fact irreconcilable with those set forth in the official documents.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Hale) sat out with the declaration that a challenge had been thrown down by the President—to be gathered from the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut—to which he would reply and would show, "that the President had omitted his constitutional duty," that he had not interfered "when there was a state of facts that would justify and call for his interference." The showing he made was an extract from an inflammatory stump speech of Gov. Reeder published last May, declaring that Kansas "had been invaded, conquered and subjugated." He does not allege that Governor Reeder made any official call upon the President for protection of the people of Kansas, or any official statement of her invasion, or, indeed, that he officially or unofficially called the President's attention to the invasion. He sagely concludes, however, that the President must have seen or heard of it, through the stump speech. And after a formal parade of that to prove a knowledge by the President of facts requiring his interference, the Senator conceded that he did not know that there was a state of facts to justify interference.

Again, that Senator, on the 3d of January last, in his violent attack upon the President, admitted "there had been nothing in Kansas to justify his official interference." But on the 28th of February, the same Senator charged, that there had been a state of facts to justify and call for Presidential interposition! In the former speech he complained, that while nothing had occurred to justify the President's interposition, yet he had interposed, whether justified or not. In the latter speech, he condemns the President for not interposing, although advertised by Gov. Reeder's stump speech of the urgent exigencies calling for federal aid! Thus the Senator appears as the President's accuser for interposing or not interposing, at the same time and under the same circumstances, ready to prove the affirmative or the negative in order to convict him of official misconduct! One who did not know the man, would never suspect the identity of the author of the two speeches of 3d of January and 28th of February last. He reminds me of a client of large resources and small conscience, who, when asked by his counsel what facts he could prove, replied, "tell me what facts must be proven, and trust me for producing the evidence."

Detention of the Secretary of War.

The Secretary of War has not escaped censure. Nor has less of the blindness of sectional bigotry been displayed in criticising his letter to Cons. Sumner and Cooke. His accusers pretend to have discovered a discrimination in favor of Missouri invaders and against free-

soil insurrectionists. Far from showing in that letter the narrow and sectional spirit of his assailants, it is marked by a moderation, philanthropy and patriotism they have not evinced and can scarcely appreciate. If, sir, the omission of the words *invasive aggression*, in the peremptory part of the letter, was designed, why should the champions of the Emigrants, and Society expect or complain? Have not their bandings covered that territory with arms, not fitted for sport but war, not designed to kill game, but men? And, with the tear of conscious blood-guiltiness, and the cunning of fraud, they strangled them into the territory in boxes, masked books or carpenter's tools. Are companies of men, specially equipped for war in New England, less deserving the name of invaders, than the Missourians with their more flowing pieces? The arrogance of pharisaical patriotism might justify the former and condemn the latter, just as it would deny the right to carry slave property there; but those whose visions are not limited to their own little section of this Confederacy, or who would not surrender to party the rights of the people of every State, can make no discrimination. If the Secretary had used the words *invasive aggression*, the Black Republicans should and probably would have understood it as menacing them; at all events, they would have howled as horribly at their use as they have done at their omission.

But, sir, the words were properly omitted, because they were unnecessary and liable to misapprehension and misapplication. The words used are co-extensive with any exigency that could have been anticipated, or that can possibly arise. The colonels are ordered to obey the requisitions of the governor for "*suppression of insurrectionary combinations or armed resistance to the execution of the law.*" What matters it, whether insurrectionary combinations or armed resistance be meditated and organized within or without the territory, by citizens of Kansas or Missouri? Whenever insurrectionists or resistants endeavor to put their illegal purposes in action, by rising up within, or entering from without, they subject themselves alike to the consequences and invoke suppression by military force of the Government. All who put themselves in opposition to lawful, civil or political authority within Kansas, are insurgents, whether residents or non-residents. All who put themselves in armed resistance to the laws, no matter whence they come, are aggressors, and if they come from without are invading aggressors.

The orders are, too, in strict conformity to the act of Congress, in spirit and letter, adopting the very language of those acts in directing when, how, and for what purpose to exert the military force of the Government. Let the assailants of the Secretary compare the orders and the acts and show where he has transgressed, or fallen short, or departed in any degree, from the law; and if they fail, as they must, to show any departure, let them blame the makers of the law, and correct its imperfections. The words *invasive aggression* should have been omitted, be-

cause they are not used in the law, under and by which, and which only, the orders were issued.

Again, they were liable to misapprehension and abusive misinterpretation. What do senators mean by a *mad invader* from Missouri? Are we so far advanced in this age of progressive departure from the provisions of the Federal Constitution, that the entrance of the people of a slaveholding state into the territories is an invasion? Or are Missourians, in free soil dialect, foreigners or savages? Is the entrance by them with arms in their hands armed invasion or invasive aggression? Does not the Constitution guarantee to them, in common with the people of Massachusetts, the right to bear arms, and freedom of transit into or out of the states or territories? And may not the militia of a state be marched into another state or a territory where the standard of rebellion or insurrection is raised against the existing Government? Does not the Constitution make this an obligation of the state governments instead of an invasion? Do senators mean to renounce this obligation, and denounce its exercise in declaring against armed invasion? Do they mean to forestall and prevent the employment of the Missouri militia for the suppression of rebellion? If so, then they may find a pretext for censuring the Secretary. But, if they use the term in the sense used by the President and Secretary, as "*invasive aggression against the organized government of the territory,*" then the orders of the latter embrace the case which they say was omitted. The orders direct the officers to comply with the requisitions of the governor, and suppress all insurrectionary combinations and armed resistance to the execution of the laws; without inquiring who are the insurgents or resistants, or whence they come. To have ordered them to prevent armed bodies of men from entering the territory, would have placed the United States troops in conflict with the Missourians—the victors of Sacramento and Chihuahua, who disdain to conceal their weapons or play the part of assassins—while piling and coward knaves might have gone in without let or hindrance, in the garb of peace, carrying, concealed in boxes, the implements and munitions of war. This would doubtless have suited them and their counsellors, but would have wronged the brave and encouraged the cowardly.

The entrance of armed men from Missouri or Massachusetts into Kansas is no invasive aggression if they go as law-abiding citizens; and the character in which they go is not to be pre-judged but determined by their acts after they enter. The Secretary was right in not pre-determining or authorizing his subordinates to pre-determine their character.

The orders of the Secretary are public acts, and a legitimate subject of praise or censure. But the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Wilson) has gone behind the order and assailed the character of the Secretary. He has impeached the integrity of his conduct and

impugned his motives. Indeed, he denied the parity of intention and propriety of action of the entire administration. He has assailed in like manner the people of the South. He alleges that they and this administration *are sustaining lawless men from Missouri in their aggressive acts—the lawless men before whom the Secretary of War shrinks and bends!* Sir, it would justly excite mirth or indignation, and provoke bitter words of scorn or contemptuous phrases of ridicule, should a brave and responsible man charge with cowering before any men, and more especially lawless men, him whose patriotism and whose courage have been attested by his blood and illustrated by his deeds on the heights of Monterey and plains of Buena Vista. But, when one who has displayed neither of those virtues, makes such a charge against such a man, he should be regarded rather with the gity with which we look upon an idiot, who cannot appreciate an emotion he never experienced.

Policy of Black Republicanism.

This discussion has indicated the policy (more distinctly developed in speeches made elsewhere) of the self-styled Republican party. They are unwilling to hazard a contest for the Presidency upon the old issues of abolition.—They do not believe that the Northern people are yet prepared to sustain them in an open assault upon the constitutional rights of the South; and hence, the repeal of the fugitive slave law, the abolition of slavery in this District, the inhibition of the inter-state slave trade and other anti-slavery measures are suppressed for the present. Even the wrongs of the slave no longer form the staple of their appeals to the Northern heart. No, the wrongs and injuries of the North and the usurpations and aggressions of the South furnish themes for their popular harangues. The South, they charge, has been robbing the North of its just share in the territories, the treasures and the honors of the Union. They affect not to be aggressors but the aggrieved; and are implacably incensed against the President for assailing their false position. The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. WILSON) denies that *there is anything in the plans or purposes of the Emigrant Aid Society hostile to the Constitution, to law, order or peace, or aggressive upon the South.* And so do all of the party to which he belongs.—The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. HALE) denies that the North has ever “*made aggression or ever means to do so;*” declares that she “*asks to stand nothing more than our equals;*” and alleges that all the men about whom he knows anything, engaged in the anti-slavery enterprise of the North, “*have always disclaimed utterly the purpose, the desire or the power to interfere with slavery in any State where it exists.*” On the contrary, he alleges that the North has always “*stood on the defensive;*” that, “*in the history of this government there has been no North except to collect revenue from,*” and is grievously exercised about the territorial acquisitions of the South and her possession of the high places of the government.

The senator from New York, (Mr. SEWARD) denies *there has been any disregard of constitutional obligations by the Northern States, and especially by New York and Massachusetts, and charges territorial aggrandizement on the South.* And addressing his constituents at Albany, last fall, made “*the danger of extending slavery*” his text, and expatiated upon the *perfidious and insidious aggressions and bold usurpations of “the privileged class,” “the slave aristocracy;”* their sectional partiality in *denying protection to Northern wool while freely giving it to the slaveholder’s sugar; in giving millions of acres of public land to Alabama for railroads or as gratuities, while not a dollar can be obtained for internal improvements in New York;* and the humiliation exacted of northern representatives as the price of *pensions to the old soldiers!*

The senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. SUMNER) takes as his text for a discourse in Faneuil Hall “*the slave oligarchy and its usurpations,*” against whom he prefers like charges and utters yet stronger denunciations.

The senator from Ohio, (Mr. WADSWORTH) in a stump speech in Maine last summer, denounces the slave power as “*a system of outrage, aggression and wrong,*” and declares the men of the North and the South are more inimical than the Russians and the English, and that “*the pretended Union now existing is all meretricious.*”

Aye, Sir, the Republican party was professionally formed to repel “*Southern aggression!*” If its leaders can persuade the North that their assertions are true, they must achieve a sectional victory in the coming elections. They invoke to their aid, not only hatred of the South as an enemy, vengeance for the wrongs she has inflicted, indemnity for past injuries and security for the future, but the instincts of self-love and self-preservation. If their assertions be true, it is not only the duty of the Northern people to sustain them at the polls, but if unsuccessful there in wresting power from the tyrants who oppress them, to take up arms and resort to revolution, as has been attempted by the Republicans in Kansas, and is approved by their advocates here. The plain import of the sentiments avowed by their leaders is, that not only the people of Kansas, but of the Northern States, are suffering intolerable wrongs and oppression, and the inevitable tendency of their appeals is to civil war and revolution. If their counsels prevail, I sincerely believe civil war must and will come. The Union was formed by the several States as friends and equals, and was designed to secure justice, tranquility and equality to every state. If it has failed to answer its purpose it is truly a meretricious Union and its days will soon be numbered.

In order to test the truth of these assertions, to determine this issue of Southern aggressions and usurpations tendered by the Black Republicans, and to vindicate the President from their aspersions, I propose to state briefly, the account between the North and the South. Let us see which section has added more, and which has appropriated more, of the Federal

Domain: which has contributed more, and which has enjoyed more of the Federal Treasury; and which has disturbed the tranquility of the other, or the harmony of the Union. The facts are neither new nor strange, but may be found in documents published by Congress.

Territorial Arrangements.

At the conclusion of peace, 1783, the states then north of Mason & Dixon's

line had, - - - - - 164,081 sq. m.

The states then south of that

line had - - - - - 647,292 "

Pending the Revolution, the Northwestern Territory excited (as Mr. Madison expressed it,) "the lucrative desires" of the Northeastern people to a degree threatening the existence of the Confederacy. That territory belonged to Virginia, by repeated royal grants, as well as by conquest achieved at her sole expense and by her unaided arms. To satisfy those desires, quiet the contest, and secure harmony and peace, she surrendered it to the Confederacy, and the ordinance of '87 devoted it to Free Soil. That surrender reduced southern territory nearly one-half, and increased northern territory nearly threefold. Northern territory was thereby swelled to - - - - - 425,761 sq. m. and southern territory reduced to 385,521 "

The territory of Louisiana, next acquired, in which slavery was maintained by both French and Spanish laws and guaranteed in the treaty of acquisition, was, by the Missouri restriction, so divided that the North took (exclusive of Oregon) - - - - - 659,138 sq. m. and the South retained - - - - - 225,456 "

By that settlement the South surrendered of slaveholding territory to the North about three-fourths and retained about one-fourth. But, including Oregon as part of the Louisiana purchase, the North took - 972,605 sq. miles, and the South retained - 225,456 " Thereby, the South surrendered more than four-fifths, and retained but one-fifth of that territory.

The acquisitions of Oregon. (if not included in the Louisiana purchase,) Florida and Texas, resulted in a division, by which the North got about - - - - - 415,467 sq. m.

And the South retained about - 271,265 " By that arrangement the North obtained about three-fifths of those territories.

The Mexican conquests engrossed by the North, added to her limits

about - - - - - 401,838 sq. m.

The South has grown from - 647,292 to 882,245 sq. miles; having added but - 235,043 sq. m. to her area since '83. In the same time the North from 164,081 has grown to 1,993,204 square miles; having added in the same time, 1,738,123 square miles to her limits. The South has increased less than fifty per cent., the North near 1100 per cent. in territorial area since the Revolution. The South commenced with more than four times the territory of the North; the North now has near two and a half times the territory of the South. The Federal Govern-

ment never held one foot of territory east of the Rocky Mountains that was free soil when acquired.—And, indeed, I question whether she ever held any west of them that was free soil.—The Northern States never ceded one foot of territory to the United States; and never yielded one foot of territory, that was free soil when acquired, to the use of the South, but have retained it all.

The South has ceded, of her own exclusive territory, 261,671 square miles, and has relinquished of other slaveholding territory when acquired, belonging in common to all the states, 972,605 square miles, and of slaveholding and non-slaveholding territory in all not less than 1,738,123 square miles—an empire elevenfold greater than the entire area of the Northern States at the peace of '83, and more than double the entire domain of the states of the Confederation. When stronger and richer than the North she magnanimously gave up nearly half her domain to hush the clamor of envy, avarice and ambition, and preserve the Confederation. When reduced by that suicidal act to a minority in both houses of Congress, on the application of Missouri for admission into the Union, the North for the first time avowed her purpose to appropriate all the territories to her sole and exclusive use, and to refuse admission to another slaveholding state into the Union. The South then yielded to the demands of dominating power more than she had given in the prodigality of her wealth to the inopportunities of dissatisfied weakness. She surrendered four-fifths of slaveholding territory to the North, and submitted to that odious interdiction prohibiting her from holding slaves north of 36° 30', on condition of the admission of Missouri and the extension of her territory south of that line. Yet in less than twelve months, Northern free-soilers violated the mis-called Compromise, by refusing to admit Missouri, and from that day to the present have persistently endeavored to transgress that line, and to deny the South the enjoyment of territories and admission of states south of it.

No impartial mind can contemplate the history of these territorial contests without being impressed with the arrogant demands on the one part, and the generous but unwise concessions on the other part. Instead of aggressing, the South has been retrogressing; instead of encroaching on non-slaveholding territory, she has been surrendering slaveholding territory; instead of demanding and exercising equal participation in the common domain, she has been conceding this right until she seems almost regarded by Northern free-soilers as a mere tenant by sufferance.

And yet, in seeming ignorance or disregard of these undeniable truths of history, we are told by some of her unjust and rapacious sons that the North has never been aggressive, that she has always stood on the defensive, only asking to stand as our equals, nothing more; and that the South has always been acquiring territory for her aggrandizement, and cutting off, selling or giving away territory at the North for her ennoblement!

Wealth of the South, and worth of Slave Labor.

But, Sir, in seeming apology for the attempt to exclude slaveholders from the territories of the United States, we are modestly told by the Senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. Wilson,) that *slave labor blasts and curses the soil*, and are assured by the Senator from New Hampshire, (Mr. Hale,) with pious philanthropy, that New Englanders cannot endure the "responsibility of sustaining, extending and perpetuating an institution which in their heart of hearts they believe to be wrong." The Senator from Massachusetts, in his desire to disparage the South and extol the North—common to all of his party—tells us, that many Southern men, emigrating to Kansas, perhaps a majority, prefer making it a non-slaveholding state. He utters this assertion, as he does all others, upon the testimony of interested witnesses, many of them hireling contributors to Northern presses, as zealously devoted to manufacturing public sentiment for the exclusion of slaveholders from the territory, as the Senator himself. That there are southrons of that class, is not improbable; but that there are, also, settlers from Northern States, who would prefer introducing slavery, I am well assured and fully credent. But the reason assigned by him for the preference given by many poor white men for free institutions, is their experience in the South of "the malignant influences which bear with oppressive force upon free labor." What those malignant influences are, he did not disclose, and I neither know nor can conjecture. In this connection, however, he speaks of our *artless, untaught, unpaid labor*, and quotes two or three lines from an agricultural Address, made by me last spring, in which I spoke of the exhaustion and impoverishment of the soil of portions of that state, "exhibiting the painful signs of senility and decay apparent in Virginia and the Carolinas." The inference deducible is, that, like all of his school of politics, he means to impress the idea that it is *slavery* which blasts the soil and causes all labor there to go unpaid. And, although he does not allege it, the implication may be fairly drawn, that my address supplied him evidence for his assertion. I do not suppose the Senator ever read, or saw, the entire address, or more of it than the paragraph from which he quoted. Had he read it, he would have learned that it maintained that agricultural labor had not only been well paid, but better paid there, in the culture of cotton, than it had been in any field tillage elsewhere; that it had enabled the state to realize about \$20,000,000 annually, from her cotton crop alone, and to become the largest exporter of agricultural products of all the States of the Union. Had he read but the paragraph preceding the one from which he quoted, he would have found that the impoverishment of our soil was properly attributed to the constant and changeless cultivation of the cotton plant, and that the folly of violating inexorable laws of Nature was illustrated in the result. That this result is caused by slave labor, is a conclusion as illogical as unjust. Indeed, I cannot

suppose that any abolitionist, or negro-philist, will concede that there is a *Divine* curse upon the labor of the negro, which prevents the earth from yielding her treasures in return for his tillage. As like causes produce like results, it will be found that artless *white* tillage has impoverished the soil, not only of the South but of the North, and of European states also, if there be any truth in agricultural reports.—Countless proofs could be cited, but as it gives me no pleasure to rehearse the errors or misfortunes of others, the statement may suffice.

If the Senator had informed himself as to the true character and condition of southern people and the products of southern soil, as evinced in our exportations, he would have found that his real or apparent triumph over her poverty, her decline and prospective desolation, was as ill-founded as malignant. He would behold her in admirable and enviable contrast with her Northern sisters. He would see that she has fewer paupers than the North in proportion to aggregate population—that her field labor is better rewarded—that her poor white laborers have more land, more money, more of the essentials of ease, comfort and independence, than a similar class in New England or anywhere else. And if he would seek for the whole truth from credible and authentic sources, instead of partial glimpses caught from garbled paragraphs and sentences, collected in abolition presses and pamphlets; if he would look at census reports, commercial and agricultural statistics, state and federal, instead of the New York Tribune, or the pamphlet of the man in Maine, who so touchingly writes of the poor whites of the South; he would find that class have far less need of his tender sympathies than many nearer home.

If the Senator from Massachusetts had examined the exports of the Union, he would have seen, that those blasted fields that offend his vision, and that artless untaught and unpaid labor which invokes his pity, yield about four-fifths of the products of our commerce. He would have learned that *cotton, rice, and tobacco*, the peculiar products of slave labor, furnish nearly two-thirds of the exports of domestic products of the Union. He would have discovered that of the average annual exports of about \$100,000,000 during the last thirty-four years, while the non-slaveholding states can claim about \$20,000,000, the slaveholding states are justly entitled to about \$80,000,000 per annum. But to present a *stronger* contrast between the *values* of the fruits of labor, North and South, and to expose clearly and *conclusively*, not only the gross error and injustice, but the extravagant absurdity of the sneer of the senator from Massachusetts, at the poverty and ill-rewarded labor of the South, I invite attention to the following facts, developed in, and sustained by the statistics of the government. The population of the cotton-growing States, viz: South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas—amounting in 1830 to less than one-seventh of the aggregate population of the Union—produced in the following decade, 1820 to 1830, in round numbers, \$21,000,000 more of our exports than all the other states.

The population of the same six States, with *Florida*—amounting in 1850 to but 129,688 more than the one-seventh of the entire population of the Union—produced during the next decade, from 1850 to 1860, in value, in round numbers, \$220,000,000 more of our exports than all the other States.

The population of the same seven States, which in 1840, amounted to less than one-seventh of the entire population of the Union by 318,000, produced in the next decade, from 1840 to 1850, in value, in round numbers, \$39,783,000 more of our exports than all the other States.

The population of the same seven states, with Texas, in 1850, amounting to less than one-sixth of the entire population of the Union, produced in the next four years, from 1850 to 1854 inclusive, in value, in round numbers \$57,892,000 more of our exports than all the other States of the Union.

Now, Sir, let it be borne in mind, that great as is the disparity in favor of the production of slave labor in Slave States manifested by the comparison instituted, it does not do those states justice—because I have only included the two products of cotton and rice exported by them, and excluded their breadstuffs, tobacco, sugar, and every other product, while I have given the other states credit for not only all their own exported products, but for much that is due to the states designated by name. It may be safely alleged that the Union is indebted for more than one-half its exports, to less than one-sixth its population contained in the eight states distinguished as cotton-growing. And as those exports form the *basis* of its imports, it may be added, that the Union is indebted to those eight disparaged and derided states for more than one-half its commerce, and to the entire slave-holding States for about four-fifths of it. I defy the Senator from Massachusetts to find any parallel for the exchangeable products, the materials of independence, of wealth and prosperity, indicated in the exports of the South. Sir, the reproach of poverty, of unrequited toil, of the malign influence of slavery upon labor, is made by uncalculating ignorance or calculating malignity. It is an off-repeated slander, which finds no substantial fact and scarce a plausible pretext on which to stand. It is one of the poisoned arrows not tolerated in honorable warfare, which the foreign and domestic foes of the South are ever discharging at her; and when shot by the hand of any son of New England is not only poisoned with calumny but barbed with ingratitudo.

What New England owes to Slave Labor.

It is the domestic produce of the South, that gives employment to the hands, and food and raiment to the bodies of the people of New England; that has multiplied her population and magnified her wealth; that has built up her Lowell and her Boston; that has made her merchants princes, and her manufacturers lords of the loom; that has reticulated her surface with railroads and studded it with thrifty villages; that has enabled her capitalists to in-

dulge in European magnificence and Asiatic luxury.

Take from New England, sir, the cotton of the South, and she would learn in the sad reverse and rapid decline of her fortunes, the hush and measurable value of her extraordinary servitude, which one of her representatives, in denigrable ignorance or more consummate indifference, denounces as a "withering, blighting and consuming curse." Take from her, the fleecy fabric of the South, and in her waste-water falls, her fireless furnaces, her moss-covered mill-wheels, her grass-grown streets, her deserted villages, her unfrequented hamlets, her dilapidated palaces, her untraveled roads—in every spot, now full of life, and blooming with the vigor of commercial health and active enterprise—would be quickly seen the sad antithesis of death!

I allude to these facts in no spirit of vain triumph. I am constrained to do so by the wanton and ill-founded taunt of the Senator from Massachusetts. I could, too, easily paint a picture, of the wrongs inflicted and sufferings endured under that system of servitude, called voluntary, in New England; which would prove that *there*, labor often fails to get its just reward. But it yields me no pleasure to contemplate the misfortunes or faults, the errors or infirmities of my fellow men—far less, those of my fellow countrymen. I rejoice rather, in their virtues, their good deeds and good fortune. I appreciate the intelligence, enterprise, industry, economy, thrift, and energy of the people of New England, and have awarded due honor and praise for their heroic struggles and achievements in every field of human endeavor, even in the very address the Senator quotes to misapply. I am ready to acknowledge, too, as in this speech, that the South is a large debtor as well as creditor of New England, deriving from her many materials of necessity and luxury. As just and friendly neighbors, they are mutually useful and beneficial. Let us, then, neither lending nor borrowing, giving nor taking, the South, would suffer far less than New England.

What New England has to sell, the South could make at home, buy elsewhere, or do without. What the South has to sell, New England cannot make at home, do without, or buy elsewhere. Cotton is the staple of her existence. She knows it, as well as she knows the plant is grown, and its fruit plucked by the hands of slaves. Yet, with all her pious horror of slavery, she gives it daily aid and encouragement, in employing slave labor, in rewarding slave labor, in using the products of slave labor, in buying from and selling to the slave owner—all for her own sake. How magnanimous and unselfish to refuse the slave owner the privilege of enjoying, like herself, the profits of slave labor in peace and quietness! How grateful and honorable to her, to curse the giver, while she pockets the gift—to denounce him as a thief, while she receives and appropriates the stolen property! Oh! sir, if she sincerely abhor the "peculiar institution," if she sincerely desire its overthrow, if her

conscience tortures her as accessory to our guilt, so long as we are permitted to hold a slave in a territory, or reclaim him when a fugitive, let her ease her troubled conscience and prove her faith by works of self-purgation and self-denial. *Then* will we believe her. Let her cease to buy, spin, weave, wear, or sell cotton. Let her cease the use of sugar, rice, and tobacco. Let her cease to buy molasses to convert into rum, with which to speculate on the vices, crimes and miseries of the human family. Let her cease the carrying trade for the South; let her send no more vessels to our ports, or to those of Cuba or Brazil. When she refuses to make or receive *any* of the profits of slave labor, or to deal with slave owners, she will vindicate her honor, and the sincerity of her pious professions of philanthropy, relieve herself from the reproach of saintly hypocrisy, and will escape the "responsibility of sustaining, extending, and perpetuating an institution which in her heart of hearts she believes to be wrong." Until she do this, she *cannot* escape that responsibility.

Disbursement of Federal Revenue.

What injustice has been done the North in distributing the federal revenue? of which she has furnished not exceeding one-fifth, or one dollar where the South furnished five dollars. Have her military defences been neglected, her harbors, rivers and roads unimproved, her soldiers unpensioned—in short, has she gotten less money than she was entitled to? Let us see:

Up to June, 1846, \$338,76 had been spent in defending with forts, each mile of northern coast from the river St. John's to Delaware Bay; only \$416.89 had been expended per mile of the coast from North Carolina to Mississippi, inclusive.

In June, 1847, \$60.01 had been expended in light houses for each mile of the northern Atlantic shore; not half that sum had been spent on the southern Atlantic coast.

The disproportion in expenditure for lamps was still greater. The South had scarcely half as many lamps, as the North had light houses in 1846.

Of \$15,291,223 expended up to 1845, upon roads, rivers and harbors, (excluding the Mississippi and Ohio, which are common to both sections,) \$12,743,407 were expended in the North; \$2,757,816 in the South; being \$2,805 for every ten miles square of the Northern States, and \$451 for each 10 miles square of the Southern States.

Of \$35,598,964 paid in revolutionary pensions from 1791 to 1838, inclusive, \$28,262,597 were paid to the North, and \$7,336,367 to the South; being \$127.39 for every soldier which the North had in the war, and \$49.89 for every soldier the South had in the war; or \$14.35 for every white person in the Northern States in 1790, and \$5.61 for every white person in the Southern States in that year. And, yet, the South furnished one hundred soldiers out of every two hundred and nine men, within her limits of military age in 1790, the

North one hundred out of two hundred and twenty-seven, according to General Knox's report; which he concedes does *not* do the South justice—because, he says, "in some years of the greatest exertions of the Southern States, there are no returns whatever of their militia."

Of invalid pensions, there was paid during the year ending 30th June, 1854, to the North \$303,652.81, to the South \$132,087.35. The State of New York, alone, received quite as much as all the Southern States, excepting Tennessee.

Of pensions of all kinds, there was paid in the same year to the South \$459,965.84, to the North \$1,068,910.30—New York alone receiving \$392,209.55. And yet the South has furnished more soldiers for all our wars than the North. The South furnished for the war of 1812 (which was fought mainly to protect Northern shipping and New England seamen) 18,288 more volunteers than the North; for the war with Mexico nearly two soldiers to one from the North; and for our Indian wars a still larger proportion. And she has done this with but little more than half the population of the North!

Up to 1850, there had been granted to the new non-slaveholding States, for internal improvements 18.5 acres for each square mile of their surface; to the new slaveholding States 9.3 acres to the square mile. Louisiana had received 10.8 acres; Alabama 9.8 acres—while Ohio had received 29.6, and Indiana 47.6 acres.

Alabama for all purposes of internal improvement, has never received as much as 1,000,000 acres of land,—nor indeed for railroads half a million of acres,—the assertion of the Senator from New York, (Mr. Seward,) to the contrary notwithstanding. New York received at one time in the distribution of the proceeds of the public lands quadruple the amount, in value, of all the public lands granted to Alabama for internal improvements of all kinds. Yet the proceeds of the public lands within Alabama limits, have brought to the Federal Treasury nearly \$20,000,000!

The bounties on pickled fish, and allowances to fishing vessels have exceeded \$10,000,000, of which nearly every cent has been paid to the North, and chiefly to New England. About \$300,000 is annually paid at the North for catching codfish!

A like disproportion in favor of the North against the South, in expenditures for postal services, for custom houses, court houses, payment of civil officers, and, indeed, every object of federal care, could be shown. And yet having, received in fortifications for her defence more than double the amount expended on the same extent of southern coast; having received a light for every twenty-odd miles, to guide and protect her mariners along her own coast, while for hundreds of miles along Southern coast, not a warning beacon cheers the storm-rocked vessel; having received \$10, in cutting roads and canals, cleaning rivers and construct-

ting harbors, where it has been given the South; having received \$1 in pensions where one has been paid the South; having received in grants of land for internal improvement two acres for one granted the South; having received in absolute bounties for her fishermen more than \$10,000,000, while no industrial pursuit of the South, has enjoyed any bounty; having appropriated all of non-slaveholding, and five-sixths of slaveholding territory, acquired, as admitted, by southern diplomacy, or southern arms, some of her sons complain that she does not enjoy a fair and just participation in the treasures and territory of the Union!

The Senator from New Hampshire, (Mr. HALE) assures his constituency that in the history of this Government, there has been no North, except to collect revenue from!"

The Senator from New York, (Mr. SEWARD) tells his constituency, that millions upon millions are lavished in war and diplomacy to annex and spread slavery at the South, while free territory at the North must not be looked upon, lest they may just after it; that millions of acres of public domain are freely given to Alabama for rail-roads or even grantees, while not a dollar can be obtained for New York harbors; that Northern Senators must humiliate themselves, to obtain justice for even their old soldiers; that protection is freely given southern industry, while it is refused Northern!

The Senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. SUMNER) adjures his constituency, by their desire for economy in the Government and improvement in their rivers and harbors, by their hatred of tyranny, which has trampled on them, to prostrate the slave oligarchy!

Southern aggressions and demands.

Sir, the aggressions and usurpations of the South have merely this extent: she has struggled with a proud spirit but feeble power in maintaining her constitutional rights and repelling assaults; in resisting the appropriation of territory acquired mainly by her own diplomacy or blood to her own exclusion; in unsuccessfully opposing the extravagant expenditure in the North of four-fifths of the revenue of the government derived from Southern toil; in exerting all means to preserve her slave property provided by the Constitution and the laws; in striving to secure for herself that justice and domestic tranquility, for the guarantee of which to all the States the Union was formed; and in winning too often, though fairly, and filling too long, though well, with her own sons, the chief executive office of the nation.

The South does not seek to exclude non-slaveholding States from the Union; but only asks the admission of those who may choose to come in as slaveholding. She does not seek to exclude Northern men or their property from the territories; but only asks that her own citizens, with their property, may, too, be admitted. She does not deny the equality of the Northern States in the Union; but only asserts her own. She does not demand any concession of Northern rights; but only asks the

acknowledgment of her own. She does not assail or disturb the domestic peace of the North; but only asks the forbearance she displays. She does not interfere with the internal affairs or social institutions of the North; but only asks the privilege of being allowed to manage her own. She offers no insult, no injury to her Northern sisters or their sons.—Can the same be truthfully alleged by all the Northern States or by their representatives on this floor? Sir, I suppose they did not weigh the truth of their denials; yet the Senators from New York (Mr. SEWARD) and New Hampshire (Mr. HALE) have both denied any disregard of their constitutional obligations by the Northern States, and the former Senator has challenged the President to prosecute, especially against Massachusetts and New York.

Slave Representations.

Mr. President, it affords me no pleasure to criminate or censure the conduct of any State, or of any portion of the people of the Union. I am unconscious of having uttered a charge on this floor that could offend the Northern people or any portion of them. I have eschewed all sectional controversies. But, Sir, I should be unjust to Northern friends, as well as futile to my constituency, if I did not accept, on behalf of the President and the South, the challenge of the Senator from New York. With that view I must revive bitter recollections.

Is it no proof of disregard of constitutional obligation to break or seek to destroy the solemn and sacred compact of the Constitution? Among them, and without which the Union would never have been formed and the destruction of which the Union can never survive, was the securing to us a representation of three-fifths of our slaves. Massachusetts has twice by her legislature—on very unanimous vote—called for an amendment of the Constitution, so as to abolish this re-presentation guaranteed by the instrument. The North would thereby lose twenty-one of her representatives, and the North would swell her majority in the other branch of Congress from fifty-three to seventy-four votes. What end has Massachusetts in view, when she proposes this amendment to the Constitution? Is it for self-defence, or is it to injure, to despoil the South? Is there neither injury nor insult offered or meditated by this menace of that state to violate her own compact with the South? And will the Senator from New York reiterate his denial that Massachusetts has shown any disregard of her constitutional obligations.

Rendition of Fugitive Slaves.

Another constitutional compact is that requiring the rendition of *fugitive slaves*. The Constitution declares that the *fugitive slave shall be delivered*, on the claim of his master. The language is plain, unambiguous and unequivocal. The purpose and the manner of its execution are beyond doubt, and were never brought in question until the discovery of that

higher law, of which the senator from New York is a prominent advocate and exponent. The fugitive slave act of 1793, looked to the agency of state officers and state tribunals for its execution. Massachusetts and New York, together with several other Northern States, had, previous to 1850, virtually nullified that act by state legislation. The acts of the States named, were specially contrived to defeat the objects of the constitutional provision, and Congressional legislation. The process of recovery was made slow, costly and embarrassing, and a trial by jury, of the fact of servitude, was required. The Supreme Court of the United States declared those acts in conflict with the Federal Constitution. The same States immediately after passed acts forbidding their citizens from aiding in the re-capture of fugitive slaves, and imposing heavy penalties upon the master for any disturbance of the peace, in any attempt to re-capture his property.

Those acts of the States, rendered the enactment of the fugitive slave law of 1850 necessary for the protection of our property. But that has in like manner been virtually annulled by the legislation of several of the Northern States. Massachusetts, "the model commonwealth," has not only virtually nullified the act of Congress, by her late legislation, but menaces with *disfranchisement* any lawyer who appears for the claimant of the slave; menaces with *imprisonment* any judge who issues a warrant or certificate, or holds even the office of Commissioner under the federal law; and menaces with *infamous punishment* any ministerial officer, or officer of militia, who aids in its execution. Failure of the claimant to establish his claim by verdict of a jury, commanded under the direction of state officers, paid out of the state treasury, and counselled by a state attorney, hired for that purpose, subjects that claimant to a heavy fine, and confinement from one to five years in the penitentiary! Thus, in contempt of the compromises of the Constitution, the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and that of Massachusetts, the slaveholder is by her legislative enactment, denied his constitutional rights, and menaced with infamous punishment, for their unsuccessful assertion; the seduction of southern slaves is encouraged; and their reclamation, according to the supreme law of the land, is forbidden!

Slave Stealing Organizations.

Is it surprising, Sir, that under the fostering legislation of Massachusetts, and New York, and a few other Northern States, companies of Slave Stealers should have been organized in the non-slaveholding States, with branches in Canada, who make the theft or robbery of our property, both their business and their boast. Their predatory incursions rob us annually, according to the estimates of distinguished members of Congress from the South, of slave property of the value of \$200,000.

But this estimate is certainly far too low. The New York Times, the mouth piece of the Senator from New York, *boasts*, that since the passage of the fugitive slave law of 1850, 35,000

slaves have escaped from the Southern States, of the value, it says, of \$35,000,000. "The most valuable slaves are those who escape," exclaims this honest editor. And he adds, "what interest in this country can survive an annual loss of \$4,000,000? Here is emancipation without the help of abolition." And these plundering bands of thieves and robbers, which if committed by any foreign power would in the days when the Union existed in *spirit*, as well as form, have aroused the whole people, North and South, to war and reprisals, not only escape all punishment, or even rebuke, but receive the countenance and encouragement of state legislatures, state governors, and their Senators on this floor!

The champion, and friend of the Senator from New York, boasts and chuckles over an annual loss by theft of \$4,000,000 of slave property! I take his estimate as more reliable than those of Southern men, because, his associations doubtless afford him information we cannot procure. The Senator from New York, perhaps, can endorse his friend's statement. And the Senator from New Hampshire, (Mr. Hale) mentions with ill-disguised joy and triumph the expenditure of \$30,000 by the Government in recapturing Anthony Burns from Boston!

Massachusetts, now and then.

But, sir, Massachusetts shall not be tried upon the testimony or convicted by the verdict of Southern men. Neither shall she be acquitted by the partial and prejudiced judgment of the Senator from New York. By her own mouth shall she be accused, and by her own judgment shall she be condemned.

Massachusetts, which in 1643 covenanted with Plymouth, New Haven and Connecticut, to restore runaway slaves, upon a mere certificate, sent from those colonies, and secured for herself the same mode of recapture of her runaways—Massachusetts, which in 1793, by legislative enactment *restored* the manumission of negroes by exacting bonds of the master, to indemnify the town in which he lived from all charge for, or about, the negro liberated, because of his sickness, lameness, or other infirmity;—and provided further, in case of manumission *without* said bond, for putting the negro to work for the benefit of said town—Massachusetts, which in 1797 punished with fine and imprisonment the harboring or entertaining of a slave without the master's consent—Massachusetts, whose own son, Nathan Dene, drew up and introduced into the Continental Congress, that provision in the ordinance of 1787, for the return of fugitive slaves—Massachusetts, whose own State Convention, in 1788, adopted the provision for the return of fugitive slaves, provided by the Federal Constitution, without a single objection, and even with the approval of her patriot son, Gen'l Heath—Massachusetts, which in 1788, in view of that same provision in the Federal Constitution, passed an act, inhibiting negro slaves from tarrying in her limits for a longer time than two months, and provided, in case of violation of it, punishment with *strikes*

—Massachusetts, whose son, George Cabot, as senator from that state, assisted in drafting the fugitive slave law of 1793, whose representatives in Congress voted for the same, and whose son, John Adams, as vice president of the United States, signed the same.—Massachusetts, whose representatives and senators in Congress voted for a law, suggested by the same John Adams, and approved by him as President of the United States, empowering and requiring the chief justice of any district into which a slave might flee to cause his apprehension and delivery.—Massachusetts, which in 1851, through her legislature, while protesting against the fugitive slave law as abhorrent to her people, yet resolved,

“That while Massachusetts entertains these views of that law, she claims no right under the Federal Constitution to nullify, disregard, or forcibly resist the provisions of an act of Congress; that she has already, when such right was claimed by the State of South Carolina, expressed her opinion upon it, and she now re-affirms and repeats the following resolution, then passed by her legislature, viz:

“That the Constitution of the United States of America is a solemn social compact, by which the people of the said States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for themselves and their posterity, formed themselves into one body politic, under a common government;—that this Constitution, and the laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made under the authority of the same, are the supreme law of the land, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding; and that no citizen, State, or other member of the body politic, has a right, in any shape, or under any pretext, to annul or prevent the execution of the said Constitution, laws, or treaties, or any of them, excepting in such extreme cases as justify a violent resistance to the laws, on the principle of the natural and indefeasible prerogative of self-defence against intolerable oppression.”

This same Massachusetts, regardless of her public honor, of her solemn stipulations of compact and confederation contained in the Federal Constitution, repeatedly acknowledged by her, now solemnly and deliberately, by her legislative action, violates her pledged faith and international integrity.

And in the face of all this—despite her own confession—the Senator from New York boldly denies that she has been guilty of any disregard of constitutional obligation! And the Senator from New Hampshire, with affected gravity denies there has been any aggression on the part of the North. Indeed, Sir, if I rightly interpret the sentiments avowed, and the public acts of both those Senators, they not only excuse and justify the nullification of Massachusetts, but also the theft and robbery of our property. The Senator from New York (if I mistake not,) refused, while Governor of that State, to deliver up a negro thief identified, and arrested there on the demand of the Governor of Virginia.

And in 1848, that Senator suggested such nullification of federal laws by state legislation, and robbery and resistance of the master, in an address to the people of New York, in which he says “*reform your own code, extend a cordial welcome to the fugitive who lays his weary limbs at your door, and defend him as you would your paternal gods; correct your own error that slavery has any constitutional guarantee which may not be released and ought not to be relinquished. Say to slavery, when it shows its bond, [that is the Federal Constitution,] and demands its pound of flesh, that if it draws one drop of blood its life shall pay the forfeit.*”

What stronger commendation could he have furnished of the nullifying law of Massachusetts? or of organized slave stealing, or of the murder of Kennedy, who perished in the effort to recover his slave in Pennsylvania? The Senator from New Hampshire justifies both the act of Massachusetts, and robbery of our slave property, in denying there has ever been aggression, on the part of the North; and, indeed, affects to find us warrant in the holy scriptures, judging from his quotation from Deuteronomy.

Perjury resorted to, to defraud slaveholders.

Nor are nullification of federal laws by state legislatures, refusal to enforce them by state governors, robbery and theft, the only expedients adopted to destroy the practical value of our constitutional right and legal mode for recovery of fugitive slaves. The general convention of abolitionists assembled in Buffalo in 1843, resolved, that whenever called upon to swear to support the Federal Constitution they would by mental reservation, except that clause, providing for fugitive slaves! Thus perjury and fraud are deliberately resolved upon and proclaimed as pious and proper means for wresting from us our property!

In fact, the doctrine is commonly held by abolitionists, and perhaps by those Senators, that a slave becomes free by removal beyond the law which maintains his relation towards his master, and that the Federal Constitution does not recognize that relationship; and hence, that whenever a slave escapes into a non-slaveholding state, he is thereby emancipated.

If, Sir, to violate the sacred compacts of the Constitution or the solemn obligations of treaties, or the laws of the land, designed for the protection of our property in slaves; if to refuse us any share in territory, which was nominally free-soil when acquired, and to exclude us even from that which was slaveholding when acquired; if to invade and rob our border states of their slaves and to refuse to deliver the fugitive, or the negro thief, on demand, and to menace with the punishment the master who seeks his slave in your hunts, be aggression, then may the South justly complain of some Northern States and their citizens.

Libels on the South.

But aggression may be committed by words no less than by deeds, by states as well as by

individuals. The slanderer or libeller is more detestable and dangerous than the robber or thief. The laws of all countries give redress to the victims of the former, as well as of the latter criminals. And does the senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Hale) know of no state or anti-slavery party, or man, in the North who has committed any aggression on the people of the South, by words more offensive and injurious than the predatory incursions of those bands of robbers who hang upon our frontiers? Is not our system of slavery habitually denounced as a *heinous crime* in the sight of God, which no human laws can justify, and no individual or state necessity can excuse or extenuate? Has not this been done by solemn legislative resolves? Is it not represented as the most atrocious robbery and the most pitiless and cruel tyranny? Are not the northern people adjured by their philanthropy, their patriotism and their religion, "*to trample Altar, Constitution, the Union, under foot,*" if necessary to emancipate the negro? Are not slaveholders painted as traitors towards their fellow-men and traitors to God, as inhuman, infamous and despicable as Algerine pirates, or South Sea Islanders? Is not a ceaseless and persistent effort made to prepare the public mind North to loathe them as rebels and treat them as outlaws? Are not Christian sects required to close their churches against them as profaners of the sanctuary; civilized communities to exclude, and avoid them as engenderers of moral pestilence? Are not the aid of the pulpit, the court, the press, the hustings, the legislative hall, and the school, invoked to heap odium and infamy upon the heads of slave-owners, and make their very name a byword of hissing and scorn? Are not the purpose and plan of abolition to invoke against the South the curse of Nineveh: "*I will cast abominable filth upon thee, and make thee vile, and set thee as a galling stock?*" I need not quote authorities to establish the fact that the reputation and renown of southern people are made the objects of systematic and persevering calumny and detraction. But, sir, as there are some recent illustrations in the speeches of men occupying seats on this floor, I will bring them to notice to-day.

In a speech at Albany, New York, in October last, the senator from New York, (Mr. SEWARD) took as his text "*the danger of extending slavery,*" and labors to prove that slaveholders are a "*privileged class,*" whom he charges with "*audacity, perfidy, and dishonesty*—with controlling the government, connecting over the North and preventing her from receiving her due share of the territories, treasures, trusts and offices of the Union.

In the same month, in another speech, at Buffalo, N. Y., the Senator from New York indulges in similar denunciations, and says: "*The non-slaveholder in the slave States is allowed no independence, no nationality.*" * * * "*whips, pistols, swords enforce not merely their silence but their active participation;*" (for slavery.) "*The right of free speech is lost to them, the right of suffrage is calculated to them, the honors and rewards of public office are denied to them.*"

This, sir, is the assertion of one, professing to speak from personal knowledge, acquired by a residence in the South! There is no difference, according to law and good morals, between the assertion of that which one knows to be false and the assertion of that which he does not know to be true. I care not which horn of the dilemma the Senator chooses, but he must take one or the other. Sir, some of my predecessors, Senators from Alabama, were non-slaveholders. Some of her Representatives in Congress, in former days, were non-slaveholders. Many of the members of her State legislature, at this day, are non-slaveholders, and many of those of past years were non-slaveholders. Doubtless, the same facts may be predicated of all the Southern States. Non-slaveholders are as respectable, as proud of spirit, as independent and tenacious of their rights as slaveholders, and no less influential.—I believe a majority of the office-holders in Alabama at this day, are non-slaveholders.—Being a slaveholder or a non-slaveholder is no recommendation or disqualification for office there.

The senator from Ohio, (Mr. WADE) speaking to a Maine audience in August last, denounces slaveholders as a "*handful of aristocrats,*" declares "*there is no more liberty for a white man in the South, unless he own slaves, than there is for the slave himself;*" complains that the South has gotten too much territory, and "*is now smearing over with her slime the whole of the northern portion of this continent with the intention of swallowing that also,*" and declares of slavery, "*It is all a system of outrage, aggression and wrong. Slavery founded in violence must always be aggressive; and the moment it ceases to be aggressive it ceases to be at all.*" That is its very life; its being is outrage; and the moment it ceases to commit these outrages that moment it runs down. Therefore if you will go along with us to restore things to the condition they were in previous to 1850, repeal this infamous fugitive slave law, and restore the rights invaded by the Kansas and Nebraska bills; if this is done, then you will not need to demand what you have a right to demand; indemnity for the past and security for the future. Let us restore things to their former position, for until we do that, our honor is not vindicated, the sense of justice of our fathers will not be appeased until we, their sons, have driven these rascals back and made them restore the rights they have stolen from us."

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. SUMNER) speaking in Boston in November last, made "*the slave oligarchy and its usurpations*" his theme, and, after showing the paucity of slave owners, says:

"Yes, fellow-citizens, it is an oligarchy, odious beyond precedent; heartless, grasping, tyrannical; careless of humanity, right, or the Constitution; wanting that foundation of justice which is the essential base of every civilized community; stuck together only by confederacy in spoliation; and constituting in itself a magnum latrocinium; while it degrades the free States to the condi-

tion of a slave plantation, under the lash of a vulgar, despised, and revolting overseer."

After charging the oligarchy with taking the lion's share of offices and trusts of the government, and enumerating its usurpations, he says:

"Fellow-citizens, I have said enough to stir you; but this humiliating tale is not yet finished. An oligarchy seeking to maintain an outrage like slavery, and drawing its inspiration from this fountain of wickedness, is naturally base, false, and heedless of justice. It is vain to expect that men, who have screwed themselves to become the propagandists of this enormity, will be restrained by any compromise, compact, bargain, or pledged faith. As the less is contained in the greater, so there is no rileness of dishonesty, no denial of human rights, that is not plainly involved in the support of an institution, which begins by changing man created in the image of God into a chattel, and sweeps little children away to the auction-block."

What more of defamation, vituperation and vilification could be expressed or conceived? What worse could be uttered of Barbary corsairs or West India buccaniers? What christian or civilized nation would form alliances with such monsters of iniquity, much less fraternize with them as members of the same political family united by common interests and devoted to the same civil destiny? What man of the least share of the virtues which constitute the grace and worth of manhood would take such mercenaries to his bosom as friends, or recognize them as associates? And yet, those who profess to abhor and condemn us, when speaking behind our backs to a Northern audience, here, on this floor, and in this city, seek the society, and, when permitted, make the acquaintance of slaveholders, salute them as equals, cordially grasp their hands as friends, and court their favor with abject sycophancy!

Mr. President: I shall not deign to vindicate my constituency or myself of calumnies so atrocious and so infamous. But I must say that those who utter them are neither faithful friends nor frank foes: they deceive and mislead their constituents at home, and betray them here; they smile on us when present and traduce us when absent: they

"Wear Friendship's mask for purposes of spite,

"Fawn in the day and butcher in the night."

Such is the conduct of one whom the senator from New Hampshire (Mr. HALE) reverences as doing honor to the Senate by taking his seat on this floor,—conduct which he humbly imitates, if his visits to the West End of this Avenue have not been grossly misrepresented. Indeed, I suppose that senator and all of his party have endorsed those calumnies by aiding in their publication and circulating them under their own franks. And, sir, the Treasury of the United States is surreptitiously used to defray the expense of enveloping their pamphlet poison for dissemination through the mails.

South represented as easy prey for her enemies.

Sir, we are not only represented as a people

worthy of universal scorn, and deserving universal enmity, but our total destruction is encouraged and invoked by rallying to arms against us, not only all the world outside our limits, but our slaves and the non-slaveholders in our midst. To embolden our outside assailants, they are assured that we are utterly impotent for purposes of resistance or defence. And to encourage insurrection within, our slaves are assured of the sympathy of the world without. The Senator from Ohio in the speech from which I have quoted, ridiculing the idea that the South can be driven by any aggressions to dissolve the Union, tells the people of Maine, that "it is mean and contemptible in Northern people to yield as they have yielded before this handful of aristocrats." "Yes, sir," says he, "the humbug of disunion has done more to cow-down the spirit of the North than all other things put together. The fear of a dissolution of this Union! My God! only think of it for a moment! A dissolution of the Union coming from the puny arm of the South. Six millions of people with three millions of mortal enemies in their very midst, and no mechanic arts,—not even the manufacture of a scow to row themselves across their rivers with! And yet they say, if you do not come to our terms, we will dissolve the partnership. Why, sir, there is not a business man anywhere, who, if he had such a partner would hesitate to kick him out at once and have done with it."

The Senator from New York (Mr. STWARD) in one of the speeches quoted, after speaking of the many bonds of the Union upon the North, says, "the slaveholders, in spite of all their threats, are bound to it by the same bonds, and they are bound to it also by a bond, peculiarly their own, that of dependence on it for their own safety. Three millions of slaves are a hostile force constantly in their presence, in their very midst. The servile war is always the most fearful form of war. The world without sympathizes with the servile enemy. Against that war, the American Union is the only defence of the slaveholders—their only protection. If ever they shall, in a season of madness, recede from that Union and provoke that war, they will—soon come back again."

While "the world without" is thus argued against us, and to "sympathize with the servile enemy," and the slaves within our limits are promised the sympathy of "the world without," these same men appeal to the pride, ambition, and envy of non-slaveholders in our midst to redress imputed wrongs by subverting the "privileged class," the "slave oligarchy." The senator from Massachusetts tells them of the malign influences which bear with oppressive force upon free labor. They are taunted by the senator from Ohio with the assertion, "that there is no more liberty for the white man in the South unless he owns slaves than there is for the slave himself;" and by the senator from New York with the assertion, that slaveholders enforce their silence and their partizanship with whips, pistols, and knives. They are told by others no less credible, though less distinguished—high officials of

the Emigrant Aid Society—that their labor is un-rewarded; that slavery taxes and degrades them; that the slave states are of small value indeed to the general government, and southern race is comparatively insignificant. And to foster these calumnies, not only is history falsified, but southern men are vouched as witnesses, and their speeches garbled, mis-quoted or unsupplied.

And these are the foul libels and incendiary appeals, not of the scavengers of literature, who live like much-worms upon corruption, but of brave and dignified men, who affect the honor, the decencies and proprieties of gentlemen; of statesmen, who aspire to make laws for the government of twenty-five millions of people, to mould public opinion, to reform public morals and enlighten the public mind; of our peers, (nominally,) who sit on this floor as the equals of all of us and the enemies of some of us, as the representatives of equal, confederate and friendly states! If such be the effusions of the contents of Black Republicanism, what must be the effusions of its cess-pools!

Now, sir, I submit to honorable men whether greater aggression, or more wanton, or more base, could be committed against any society than such atrocious libels upon the southern people, and such violent and incendiary attacks upon their domestic institutions. They are intended and calculated to destroy all faith in them, to bring them under universal reprobation, to subvert, prostrate and annihilate them. And yet,

“With that dull, rooted, callous impudence,
Which God to shame and every vice to sense
Never bashed, unless in spreading vice’s snares,
She stumbled on some virtue unawares.”—

we are told there has been no aggression, no wrong done us; and the *President* is assailed with bitter invective by those who participate in or approve these assaults, because, with true moral courage, and a just regard for our constitutional rights, he alludes to those citizens of the North who officiously intermeddle with our social institutions, and who are permanently organized in associations to inflict injury upon us by wrongful acts, which would be cause of war between foreign Powers, and only fail to be such in our system because perpetrated under cover of the Union.

Plans and purposes of Abolition.

The senator from New Hampshire, (Mr. HALE)—the friend and associate of our assailants—assures us, that all the anti-slavery men he knows, “disclaim utterly, the purpose, desire or power to interfere with slavery in the States where it exists.” There are none so deaf as those who *will not* hear; none so blind as those who *will not* see. Has he never seen or heard of those, among whom Lyander Spooner is prominent, who deny that either the Constitution, the acts of 1793 or 1850, require the surrender of fugitive slaves; who declare that slavery itself is unconstitutional; and that Congress should through its courts, backed by military force, exert its power to abolish the institution in the states; and for that end should

arm, organize and discipline the slaves as militia? Has he never heard of Phillips or Wright, Parker or Beecher, sage lawyers and pious doctors of divinity, who conceding the constitutionality of slavery, propose to trample on constitution, laws, and if need be, the *Bible*, in order to put down slavery, and adjure the North to do so; peaceably if it can, forcibly if it must? Has he no knowledge of societies, who annually announce and advocate the same propositions in their resolutions and addresses?

Sir, I was amazed at the declaration, even from the lips of the senator from New Hampshire, for, notwithstanding his imputed addiction to trifling, and want of credit for sincerity, I did not think him willing to go into voluntary bankruptcy. No one can doubt that the senator knows many more anti-slavery men than any southern does, who are willing, ready and eager to assail slavery in the states, and only bide the time when they think they can do so safely and efficiently. He only deceives himself if he suppose such declarations from him deceive any one else. I need not go out of this hall to find those who have avowed anti-slavery sentiments as extreme as can be uttered and express the purpose and desire to interfere with slavery in the states where it exists. The senator from New York, (Mr. SEWARD) avowed as much eight years ago, when he declared there were “two antagonistic elements of society in America; freedom and slavery”—“that the party of freedom seeks complete and universal emancipation”—that slavery “*can be and it must be abolished*, and you and I *can and must do it*”—and advised the cautious and insidious, but relentless and persistent model by which to “bring the parties of the country into an effective aggression upon slavery.” He did not define his measure of abolition, but declared that “whenever the public mind shall will the abolition of slavery the way will open for it.”

I think it was John Quincy Adams who said, there were half a dozen clauses of the Constitution under which slavery might be abolished in the States. Who can doubt that a way would be opened, if necessary, through the bowels of the Constitution, to achieve the work by a party possessing the legislative and executive branches of the government, and thinking with the senator they could and must abolish slavery. Indeed, did not the senator deny to slavery the protection, guaranteed it by the Constitution, when he said last fall that “it [slavery] is in violation of every line of the Declaration of Independence and the whole summary of personal rights contained in the Constitution?” And did he not invoke abolition, even to save the Constitution, by declaring, “Slavery is not and never can be perpetual. It will be overthrown either peacefully or lawfully under this Constitution, or it will work the subversion of the Constitution, together with its own overthrow.”

The senator from Massachusetts (Mr. WILSON) avowed a like purpose and desire in a lecture at Boston, last spring, when he declared with heroic egotism, “Send it abroad on the wings of the wind that I am committed, fully committed, committed to the fullest extent, in

favor of IMMEDIATE AND UNCONDITIONAL ABOLITION OF SLAVERY, wherever it exists under the authority of the Constitution." Where he purposed to abolish slavery, is exclaimed in his letter, shortly after, to Wendell Phillips, in which he says: "I hope, my dear sir, we shall all strive to unite and combine all the friends of freedom, forget each other's faults and shortcomings in the past, and all labor to secure that co-operation by which alone THE SLAVE IS TO BE EMANCIPATED and the domination of his master broken. Let us remember that more than three millions of bondmen, groaning under nameless woes, demand that we shall cease to reproach each other, and that we labor for THEIR deliverance!" Thus, he points to the slaves in the states as those for whose immediate and unconditional emancipation he wishes to unite all the friends of freedom.

His colleague (Mr. SUMNER) has often avowed the same designs, and did last fall, at Boston, when, after appealing to avarice and ambition, to prostrate the "Slave Oligarchy," for the sake of the treasures and offices of the Federal Government, he adds, as the crowning glory of such a triumph, "Prostrate the slave oligarchy, and you will possess the master key with which to unlock the whole house of bondage. Prostrate the slave oligarchy, and the gates of emancipation will be open at the South."

No one can misunderstand this language. It means that when we are trampled under foot, and impotent for our defence, those who have their heels upon our necks will be able to dictate their own terms of emancipation to the Southern States.

But, Sir, why should I adduce proof of a fact which is as notorious as is the existence of an Abolition or Free Soil party, and is known to to every reading man in the world, except, forsooth, the Senator from New Hampshire, —taking his word for it.

Nor are those who concede that slavery in the States is beyond the reach of Congress under the Constitution and profess their purpose to let it alone there, but yet avow their intention and their power to assail it in the territories, this District, and wherever the national flag floats, less disposed, or less determined to effect abolition in the states. They have the same goal in view but propose to approach it by a circuitous instead of a direct path. They intend to constrain the States to do what radical abolitionists propose to do by Congress, or by force of arms.

What is the purpose of nullifying the fugitive slave act, and the constitutional provision under which it was framed by personal liberty laws? The Abolitionists respond:

"Give the panting fugitive this inestimable right, [trial by jury,] in every Northern State he is safe—for where can you find twelve impartial men among us, who will decide on their oaths, that a man has not a better right to himself, than another has to him,—that the blood which runs in his veins is not his own,—that the right to liberty is not inalienable. Secure this right to fugitives, and all the Northern States of the Southern part of the Confederacy will be drained of their slaves."

What is the object of abolishing the Slave Trade between the States? The Abolitionists reply: "were it not for this grand canal of horrors, the 'infernal slave trade,' the dark waters would overflow and drown the profitability of the system in these States, and compel them to emancipate in order to save themselves from destruction." "Cut this infernal artery, the monster would die, starvation would slowly but surely consume him in his Southern, and woe-beg in his Northern abode. Fifteen years would number him among the dishonored dead."

Why abolish slavery in this District? The Abolitionists say, "the moral influence of it would pierce to the heart of the whole system. It would pronounce and sign its death warrant. It would be the solemn verdict of the nation, decreeing the annihilation of this dark abomination. The highest legislative body of the Union representing the whole people would declare slavery *unfit to live*,—for let us not forget that Congress will abolish it, *not because it has the power, but because of its intrinsic wickedness*. The act would speak in authoritative tones to every slaveholding State, "*Go thou and do likewise*." It would write in letters of flashing fire, over the gateway of the national Capitol—"no admittance for slavery." The whole system would thus be "*out-laved, branded with ignominy, consigned to execration and ultimate destruction*."

Why prohibit Slavery in the Territories? The Abolitionists say, "it is our final hope for the extermination of slavery. Six or eight large States shall not march into the Union with war-banners floating in the breeze. Open the doors wide and beckon in State after State from the northwest, and the general government is in our hands. Then the perpetuation of freedom will be the great idea of national legislation. Slavery will melt away before its burning action, till the last vestige of it shall have disappeared."

Thus, are we assured by the Anti-slavery Societies in their Annual Addresses, that in all these measures they have the same end and object in view—THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN THE STATES. They also assure us that they esteem as most efficient of all these measures, the increase of non-slaveholding States in the West.

What is the avowed purpose of those who on this floor oppose the admission of slaveholding States into the Union? The Senator from Massachusetts, (Mr. SUMNER,) if my memory serve me, said, "confine slavery to its present limits, and it will die of inanition like a spider under an exhausted receiver."—Governor Chase of Ohio, said "it would localize and discourage it." The Senator from Vermont, (Mr. COLLAMER,) said the Northern people "consider that the extension of slavery over more country is to encourage and perpetuate it. That the more it is circumscribed, the less is it productive, and the sooner will be emancipation."

And, Sir, I might multiply quotations from numerous high authorities affording cumulative evidence of the same fact, that all of the measures proposed by those who disclaim a purpose

to interfere with slavery in the States, but intend merely to denationalize and localize it, are conceived in the wish, and exerted with the expectation that they will overthrow slavery in the States. The *indirect* consequences of the acts, are the *direct* objects they hope to achieve. They seek the same end with radical abolitionists, but by different means. The course of the latter is less odious and dangerous than that of the former. The one is open, direct and manly; the other, insidious and dastardly. The one would afford an opportunity to repel the aggressor, or perish in the effort; the other would bind and paralyze us, and then starve us to death. The one offers no false hopes, but would destroy by one fell blow; the other illudes us with promises of mercy while slaying us alive. The one deny the obligations of the Constitution, or admitting them, insist on a rescission of the contract, and a dissolution of the Union, in order that they may give free vent to their hostility, unrestrained by pledges of faith; the other, thinking they can accomplish abolition in the Union and still enjoy navigation acts, fishing bounties, tariffs and internal improvements, affect to love it, and reverence the Constitution while accepting all the benefits it confers, and evading the duties it enjoins.

An army with banners is preferable to a Trojan horse. All the anti-slavery measures which have been suggested are legitimate fruits of abolition upon which avarice and ambition feed and batten.

Progress of Abolition.

The first general abolition society in the United States was formed in Boston in 1832. They declared their object was, "to effect the abolition of slavery in the United States, and to obtain for free people of color equal civil and political rights and privileges with the whites." They presented to the slaveholder the alternative of "life or death." They said, "the master must manumit his slave, or the slave will manumit himself;"—to manumit him, is "to shut the flood-gates of human woe and human blood;"—to hold him in vassalage will "have a direct tendency to unsheath the sword of vengeance, revolution and death." Such were their avowals of purpose,—such their sombre vaticinations. Yet they only proposed to exert moral means. The next year, the American Anti-Slavery Society was formed in New York. They professed the same purposes, but proposed the exertion of *political*, as well as moral means; to invoke the aid of the pulpit, the press, and the school to teach "that slavery is a heinous crime in the sight of God, and that the duty, safety and best interest of all concerned require its immediate abandonment without expatriation;" "to invoke Congress to put an end to the domestic slave trade, to abolish slavery in all those portions of our common country which comes under its control, especially in the District of Columbia, and likewise to prevent its extension to any state that may hereafter be admitted." All unlawful means in effecting it were however disclaimed.

What they have achieved has been partly told. Their growth has kept pace with population; their demands have increased with their power. Despised, hooted and mobbed twenty years ago, they now constitute a strong political party confessedly; they *allege* the first in point of numbers in the Northern States. They have rent asunder all orthodox christian denominations, but three, and sectionalized them under the designations of Northern and Southern Churches. They influenced the Methodist Church North to violate the precepts of religion and principles of common honesty, by appropriating to its exclusive use the common property without even the plea of *necessity*, with which the highwayman excuses his robbery. They have induced a general adoption by those churches of their shibboleth, *no communion with slaveholders*. They have supplanted the religion of Christ, with the gospel of abolition—inasmuch that their ministers every Sabbath proclaim war against the South instead of "peace, good will towards men," and teach the damnation of slaveholders instead of the salvation of sinners. They have rendered valueless the constitutional right of southern men to carry their slaves into or through several of the non-slaveholding states, and have made the slaveholder so odious in those states that he is greeted with insult and injury whenever he enters them. They have made it cause of reproach to befriend a slaveholder. They have driven southern students from northern colleges, and many southern travellers from their cities and watering-places. They have extorted from the legislatures of at least five northern states, acts virtually nullifying the fugitive slave laws of 1793 and 1850, and violating both confederate and constitutional obligations. They have acquired entire control of the legislature of Massachusetts, which has not only twice adopted a motion to amend the Constitution by abolishing slave-representation in Congress, but has initiated, under its paternal auspices, that *rare of absorption* which one of her sons contemplates with complacency and doubt as to its result, by *legalizing* the marriage of *blacks and whites!* In Massachusetts, coarse sensualism and refined taste may now gratify depraved or morbid appetites in free commerce of the sexes of every hue, from sooty black to Parian white, under the sanction of lawful *wedlock!* And, judging from the social affinities of the races thus declared, and the reported amalgamation already begun in Massachusetts, the time may not be remote, when one of her senators may offer, to introduce at the levees of a President his sable spouse, and claim for her that equality here which she enjoys at home!

Defence of Southern Immigrants in Kansas.

And now, sir, I ask, is it surprising that the people of Missouri, and of the entire South, should regard the movement of Massachusetts, for colonizing Kansas, with distrust and disfavor, with apprehensions for their safety and a disposition to fortify and defend themselves.—

Seeing what feudalism has achieved, and comparing what it proposes, how could the people of Missouri fail to exert every means reconcilable with constitutional or natural law, to prevent the planting of a colony in their midst, embodying the sentiments and principles, the civil laws and ecclesiastical regulations maintained by the dominant party of Massachusetts? Had she proposed to convert Kansas into a *penal colony*, would Missourians have been at fault in resisting? Had she proposed to transfer there the foreign white *paupers*, who, with amiable philanthropy, she has forced back to their trans-Atlantic homes, would Missouri have had no excuse in her example, in repelling or expelling them? Yet, how much more detestable and dangerous than mendicants or criminals, are those who are taught by precept and example to disregard the Constitution and the laws, and even the Decalogue itself, in order to achieve their ends? Paupers are drones who tax society, but do not menace its existence. Ordinary felons are content with a small sphere of operation, and with a few victims on whom to glut their evil passions, and rarely exhibit in a single individual a violation of *all* the laws of the land.—When they break the law they acknowledge its majesty, and admit the justice of its penalties.

But abolitionists deny all authority, human or divine, which permits involuntary servitude; advocate emancipation of the *black race* at every hazard, and by any sacrifice of the *white race*; counsel universal *treason* against the laws of man or God to resist imputed wrongs, and invoke universal rapine and desolation for their redress! They teach the slave that his master is a tyrant towards him and a traitor towards God.—That to escape from him, by fraud or force, by falsehood, arson, murder, any means, is approved of God and all good men. They teach non-slaveholders to sympathize with fugitive slaves, to harbor them, to resist all who would arrest them, to *defend them as they would their household gods*, and to violate any law which conflicts with their rescue. They present the slaveholder the alternative offered by the highwayman to his victim,—*your property or your life*. This dread prophecy of abolition in 1832 has already become dire reality, as the loyal blood of Kennedy, Gorsuch and Batchelder attests. And, what is more appalling than death, to the brave men of the kind of Daniel Boone, and as horrible to their chaste daughters as dishonor, they proclaim, as a necessary incident or consequence of emancipation, the elevation of blacks to perfect equality with whites and a race of absorption between them! What could be expected but enmity, dissension and bloodshed between contiguous States with populations so antagonistic in sentiments and principles as Massachusetts abolitionists and Missouri slaveholders? Yet, Massachusetts has endeavored to make Kansas a seminary in which to plant all the abolition ideas I have enumerated, well knowing that such evils as domestic strife, fraternal bloodshed, and per-

haps civil war would be produced. And the Senator from Vermont, (Mr. COLLAMER,) professing to be a man of peace, and to look forward with joyous hope to that millennial period when nations shall no longer go to war, says in his report, in substance, that these evils would possibly ensue, but that Massachusetts did right! And those other men of peace, the Senators from Massachusetts, (Mr. SUMNER,) and New York, (Mr. SEWARD,) say well done by Massachusetts, and well spoken by the author of the report. And the Senator from New Hampshire, (Mr. HALE,) contemplating the impending strife in Kansas, but protesting he is not a man of war, avows that he has "sometimes wished that God, in his Providence, would let it come!"

When I hear such inflammatory speeches from those standing here as guardians of that Constitution which was designed to ensure domestic tranquility, and who, by virtue of their senatorial office, have acquired an influence when all their talents combined would scarce impart to a private citizen, I am reminded of the priest who set fire to the temple with the flame he had stolen from the altar. Sir, the madness of the times has dis-layed no more frantic exhibition than we have witnessed on this floor. Divested of all the drapery of rhetoric, the plain logic of the champions of Black or Red Republicanism in Kansas is this: the natural and necessary results of the colonization of Kansas with abolitionists, are domestic violence and civil war; but these are lesser evils than slavery;—therefore, let them come! The simple solution of the issue between pro-slavery and anti-slavery men in Kansas, which they anticipate with complacency, and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. HALE) with joy, is the bloody argument of battle, and the arguments to be used are grape, canister and cold steel! But his joy is not

"That proud joy which warriors feel,

In meeting foemen worthy of their steel!"

but the joy of one in conscious security from danger, while looking out from his loophole of retreat over fields of human carnage.

The attempt to justify the course of Massachusetts in undertaking to control the destiny of Kansas by precedents, or to reconcile it with her obligations to her sister states, is not less insulting than disingenuous. Those who cite the settlement of the original colonies, by England, or the western wildernesses, by the different states of our Union, *know*, that they were not stimulated by the inducements, the motives, the feelings or the objects which gave rise to the Massachusetts movement towards Kansas. It was not to get rid of a redundant population, to wrest a wilderness from savages for the use of civilized men, to open new fields of commerce, to increase the defenses or add to the strength of our common country, that Kansas was coveted. Immigration to that territory was matter of neither necessity nor choice. No, Sir, deep seated and ungenerous hostility towards the South, or, if it be preferred, to the slaveholders of the South, originated the Emigrant

And finally, it was not a demonstration of hostility to the South more offensive and more excusable than any former legislative effort to lighten slavery by southern slave States. Hitherto, offensive legislation was intended to operate on persons or things, within their own limits, or, if beyond them, through Congressional acts. Each were their personal liberty, life, and their instruction to their senators and representatives to vote against the admission of slaveholding States, and in favor of the abolishment of slavery in this District. This was the first effort to enact State laws, to operate extra-territorially against slavery. It was the first crusade against a server, initiated, organized and prosecuted, under the auspices of a State. Congress, in 1850 and 1854, had settled the doctrine of non-interference, and disclaimed the power of the Federal Government to regulate the internal policy of the Territories, or to mould their domestic regulations. But, this supreme power, disclaimed by Congress and denied to belong to the General Government of the States, is arrogated by the single State of Massachusetts, increased by the neutrality of Congress she has resolved to lay her own hand upon slavery, and wrench it out from Kansas. She has attempted to legislate for Kansas and to govern it through the medium of a great minded corporation, sitting in Boston.

Knowing that slavery to some extent existed in that territory, and that its proximity to Missouri and sources of latitude, soil, climate and productions, tended to establish that institution; knowing that emigration proceeds mainly in the same parallel of latitude, and that those in the Western States who might be induced by interest, or driven by necessity, to go West, would follow the main body of emigrants, and find homes in the mid-rozen wilderness of Illinois and Iowa, of Minnesota or Nebraska;—those who controlled the legislation of Massachusetts and have availed themselves of it, in order to divert this current of emigration from its natural and accustomed channel and pour it into Kansas, have invoked the combined aid of the vilest passions of depraved humanity and the most ferocious and ferocious fanaticism.—Sectional envy, jealousy and hatred of the South, have been aroused by representing the repeal of the Missouri restriction as conceived in the wish and framed for the purpose of extending slavery, and increasing in its policy upon the rights of the North; and the Northern people have been aroused by their self-love and self-respect to resent the insult and revenge the injury. And yet the very men who bewail the abolition of the Missouri restriction in affected strains of grief and indignation as a breach of plighted faith, never kept the faith when an opportunity was afforded for its violation for their benefit and our injury, and never failed to denounce the restriction and stigmatize it as the odious *Black Line*, or *Horrible Line*, while it existed. They talk with well-learned greed of the portentous increase of the slave power under that act, and of the past and prospective aggressions and usurpations of the "slave oligarchy," well knowing that the South has

been retreating instead of advancing in relative territorial extent and political strength, that she has yielded in territory and treasure to the aggrandizement of the North and her own emancipation, until she is now unable to maintain her rights in the Union, and is dependent upon the Democratic party, the Constitution and party of the North, for their preservation. They deprecate, in piteous and pious tones, the increase of slavery and the aggravations of the wrongs of the black race, well knowing that their introduction there will not add one to the existing number of slaves, and will tend rather to ameliorate their condition.

Not content with appealing to anti-slavery feeling, to sympathy with the negro and hatred for his owner, to ambition and the love of sectional domination, they appealed to a passion which we are assured by one of the agents and orators of the Emigrants' Aid Society never fails to unite the North,—the love of money. They promised to make "a good thing of it,"—that is, a scheme for realizing large pecuniary rewards for small risks. They proposed to colonize Kansas with anti-slavery paupers, men "who could not do without the advantages afforded them by that society,"—"to be retained in its cause,"—"to be under control of that organization,"—"to be bound to it,"—"to be under bonds to make Kansas a free State." I quote from the address of Mr. Thayer, the agent of the society.—The organization was to secure them cheap transportation to Kansas, and there to build their dwellings, mills, churches, and school-houses. Thus much has been conceded by a prominent member of the Emigrants' Aid Society, Mr. Thayer, in his public address. Thus much of the mode of working and the materials to be used has leaked out of Mr. Thayer in his appeals to the Northern public for aid in this enterprise. Although, in the same address, he affects that the company will and do transport all who apply for aid without inquiring for their views of slavery, yet his own admissions negative this assertion. He pledges, upon condition of certain modulated contributions, to send enough men under bonds to make Kansas a free State. He admits that those sent cannot do without the advantages afforded them by the society; that they are "its retainers, under its control"—bound to it as apprentices. The Emigrants' Aid men are, confessedly, not freemen, but *villains* in the service of the company; not free agents, but agents of the company; dependants, unable to stand alone; beneficiaries, living on the bounty of their patrons. They go to Kansas, not of their own will or choice, but by the inducements offered by the company. They do not go relying on their own strong arms and brave hearts for support, but trusting to the company to afford them those advantages they cannot do without. They do not go to organize a State, but to mould one after the model prescribed in Massachusetts. Nor are Mr. Thayer's declarations the only evidence afforded that those emigrants are the hirelings, dependants, and legemen of that society.—The entire programme of their proceedings,

from the advent of the first cargo landed in Kansas up to the last scene of the farce enacted by the mock legislature at Topeka, had been published in Boston and New York in advance of the various performances. The Eastern seers have enjoyed the rare triumph of witnessing the complete fulfilment of their prophecies in Kansas; but they have consulted the organs of the Aid Society who keep the book of fate for that territory. Indeed, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. WILSON) has displayed the same prophetic spirit on this floor, having told us several weeks in advance what has been done by the amateur legislature at Topeka.

But, sir, there is one part of the machinery of the incorporation for ruling Kansas, that has not been fully explained; and that is, when and how the stockholders are to derive the profits of their investments. Whether to be paid in money, in land, or in labor, by their hirelings; whether in speculations in town-lots, or the public lands, or the Indian reservations, is somewhat questionable. The bold blunder of Governor Reeder, however, coupled with the statements of the Secretary of the Emigrant Aid Company, directing what sites are to be located for the company, and for what purposes, show that they propose to speculate on the ignorance and helplessness of the Indians, in getting possession of their lands, and, perhaps, on the frauds and perjuries of their hand-planters whom they may place as settlers and pre-emptors on the government lands.—We are warranted, by the orders of the Secretary and the example of the Governor, in saying that they mean to get land; honestly, perhaps, if they can, but, if not, still they mean to get land. They are not scrupulous about laws or treaties.

Enough of their policy has been developed by their organs to show, that the scheme is at war with the just and liberal spirit of the land laws of the United States, which were intended to secure homesteads, on easy terms, to the landless, and to prevent speculations in the public domain, or the appropriation of large bodies of land by individuals or by associations with great accumulated capitals.

But, if combinations of little bands of speculators, united in interest by small capital, should endanger popular rights and excite the apprehensions of Congress, so as to induce the most stringent legislation to defeat their schemes, how much more dangerous and detestable a State corporation, whose named capital is told by millions, and which aims at the appropriation of an entire territory to the exclusion of the people of fifteen states of the Union! Individuals, or private companies, would absorb a few sections, or at most, a township, while nothing short of a territory will satiate the State corporation's lust of dominion. I have heard of the hardy pioneers organizing and arming themselves, preparatory to an approaching sale of the public lands, in order to silence by force, if necessary, the land monopolists who should attempt to purchase their humble homes. Is it surprising, that this mammoth

corporation, which proposes to grasp a wilderness, whose boundaries are described by parallels of latitude and longitude, and settle it with its tenants, should excite the indignation and provoke the resentment and resistance of those who dwell upon its borders?

And is it possible, that any senator will justify these contemplated schemes of land monopoly by the Emigrants' Aid Society? If Massachusetts, or a Massachusetts corporation, had proposed to buy the territory, Congress would not dare sell it on any condition. If the State, or its corporation, through its agents, offered to enter the lands of the territory, it would not be permitted at the land offices or tolerated by the government. Wherein lies the difference between the State or its corporation buying the territory or entering the lands there, and the hiring emissaries of the State doing the one or the other for the benefit of the corporation? There is none in principle; it is achieving the same thing by different means. It is assuming dominion in the former case, openly and directly, in the latter covertly and indirectly. The former is honest; the latter dishonest. That it was intended and proposed to appropriate the territory to free-soilers, by money power, the power of associated capital, is distinctly proclaimed. That same Mr. Thayer says, comparing the Emigrant Aid Society with the *Southern* emigrants, "we put our riches against their poverty, and say they cannot stand them." I could cite many similar declarations to show that land monopoly by the strength of associated capital was its aim and object.

Although the Constitution nowhere inhibits the intervention of a State in the affairs of a Territory, yet the attempt of Massachusetts to govern Kansas by laws passed in a State legislature at Boston, would clearly be an invasion of the rights of other States to which they would scarcely submit. This, I presume, will be conceded by all the Senate, except, perhaps, the Senator from New York, (Mr. SEWARD,) who declared, that, "*whatever is not expressly forbidden by the Federal Constitution may lawfully be done by the States!*"—a sentiment not only hostile to the peace of the Union, but to public virtue and State honor. But wherein is there any real or practical difference in Massachusetts passing laws to operate on the people of Kansas, and governing them through the medium of a State corporation sitting in Boston? If there be any, it is in favor of the government of the State, rather than of her corporation.

Nor did the patrons of this eastern emigration rely upon the strength of money and numbers alone, to abolish Kansas. Despite the positive denials of their champions on this floor, their hirelings were equipped for violence and war. They did not carry with them the implements of industry, but the instruments of death. Cannon and Sharp's rifles were their tools of trade. It has been said on this floor, that fire-arms were not carried there until the invasion of the "Border Ruffians." To disprove this assertion, I will not adduce the testimony of Missourians, members of Congress, and private citizens, or of the dele-





